Remarks

Claims 1-14 are pending.

Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by MeLampy et. al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0114282).

In the rejection and the response to arguments, the office action states that MeLampy associates TRIBS such that there is one TRIB per VPN. The office action states that this is disclosed in paragraphs 71 and 72, referring back, apparently, to the mention of using MPLS tags with VPNs in paragraph 11. Paragraph 71 of MeLampy merely discusses the use of local policies. Examples of these local policies are given in paragraph 68, and does not include nor suggest mention of any type of VPN policy. Further, as VPNs are network-wide, they would not be included in a local policy. Paragraph 72 discusses the configuration of the various fields shown in Figures 3a and 3b, including a session description protocol (SDP) MPLS description field.

While MeLampy mentions the use of MPLS tags for VPNs as an example in the background, and discusses the use of MPLS tags in a descriptor field in the carrier data object, the actual disclosure of MeLampy does not connect these two ideas together. MeLampy is directed to handling packet flows in a network for real-time transport protocol. MeLampy does not disclose any type of VPN structure and the mere mention of VPNs as a possible application of a protocol (MPLS) for VPNs does not anticipate the use of TRIBs to define VPNs. Referring to paragraphs 449-456 of MeLampy, it can be seen the use of MPLS in the system disclosed has nothing to do with VPNs.

Further, MeLampy specifically discloses that the TRIBs on a particular device are associated with each external peer, not with a VPN. See paragraphs 109, and 0132 as examples. Therefore, MeLampy discloses a TRIB per external peer, where an external peer is any device outside the particular device, not a TRIP per VPN.

Claims 1, 7, 11 and 14 have been amended to more clearly define the associations of one TRIB associated with one VPN associated with one ingress gateway. It is therefore submitted that these claims are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 2-6 depend from claim 1, claims 8-10 depend from claim 7, and claims 12-13 depend from claim 11. These claims inherently contain all of the limitations of their respective base claims. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach, show nor suggest all of the limitations of the base claim, much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims. It is therefore submitted that claims 2-6, 8-10, and 12-13 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

No new matter has been added by this amendment. Allowance of all claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Customer No. 20575

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

Julie L. Reed

Julie L. Reed
Reg. No. 35,349

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW Morrison St., Suite 400
Portland, OR 97204
503-222-3613